

### REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 8-9, 11 and 14-27 are pending. Of those, claims 1-3, 8-9 and 14-19 are under examination and claims 20-22 have been withdrawn. New claims 23-27 have been added.

Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite: “the stator yoke including a plurality of stator sections, each stator section encompassing all the pole shoes of one phase and each section axially extending to define a portion of the total axial length of the stator.” Claim 9 has been amended to recite similar features. Support for the amendments is found throughout the specification, for example, at page 3, line 6-13 and at page 7, lines 8-21.

#### Anticipation Rejection over Schaeffer

Claims 1-3, 8, 14 and 19 stand rejected as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,315,171 to Schaeffer. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended herein is patentable over Schaeffer.

Referring to Figs. 13 and 14, Schaeffer shows that segments 66 interlock with each other to form an axial length of the stator. (See also, col. 10, lines 53-66.) While the total axial length of the yoke is formed by interlocking the shown segments, it is apparent that each segment individually defines the total axial length of the stator. The configuration of Schaeffer neither discloses nor suggests the claimed embodiment where each section defines “a portion of the total axial length of the stator”.

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Schaeffer. Each of claims 2-3, 8, 14 and 19 depends from claim 1 and is deemed patentable by the virtue of this dependence. Accordingly, additional reasons for patentability of each of claims 2-3, 8, 14 and 19 will not be discussed.

Anticipation Rejection over Takehara

Claim 9 stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,804,896 to Takehara et al. ("Takehara"). Applicant respectfully submits that the claim 9, and all claims depending therefrom, are patentable over Takehara.

In Fig. 1, Takehara shows a stator assembly having a stator yoke 18 constructed from a number of sheet metal stator laminations. Fig. 2 of Takehara shows a cross-sectional view taken along the line P-P of Fig. 1. All stator laminations are identical as the cross-section of each stator lamination corresponds to the cross-section of the entire stator yoke. In other words, Takehara's laminates are "stamped sheets" that combine to form a stator stack. Consequently, each sheet includes the poles for all phases. In contrast, claim 9 recites in pertinent sections: "each stator section encompassing all the pole shoes of one phase." (emphasis added.)

For at least this reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection over Takehara.

Anticipation Rejection over Kometani

Claims 1-3, 8, 14 and 19 stand rejected as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,166,471 to Kometani et al. ("Kometani"). In supporting the rejection, the Examiner points to Figs. 2, 4, 8-9 and 16 of Kometani, with an emphasis on Figs. 8 and 9 of the reference. See Office Action, paragraph 4.

Inasmuch as U.S. Patent No. 6,166,471 to Kometani has only 6 figures (Figs. 1-6) Applicant fails to understand the basis for the Examiner's rejection. To this end, Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case for anticipation over Kometani has not been made. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejections

Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected as allegedly obvious over various combinations of references of record. Each of claims 17 and 18 depends from claim 1, which as discussed, is patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, claims 17 and 18 are deemed patentable at least by the virtue of their dependence from an otherwise patentable independent claim and additional reasons for patentability will not be proffered.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 17 and 18 are respectfully requested.

Allowable Claims

At page 7 of the Office Action the Examiner objects to claims 15 and 16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Examiner states that claims 15 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, claims 24 and 25 have been presented to include the recitations of claims 15 and 16, respectively, in combination with the recitation of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 24 and 25 are in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

Having addressed each and every issued raised in the pending Office Action, Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

While an extension of time is not deemed necessary, the Office is requested and hereby authorized to charge the appropriate extension-of-time fees needed to maintain the application pending against Deposit Account No. 04-1679 to Duane Morris LLP.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any issues pertaining to the instant application.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark C. Comtois	Reg. No. 46,285
L. Lawton Rogers, III	Reg. No. 24,302
D. Joseph English	Reg. No. 42,514
Patrick D. McPherson	Reg. No. 46,255

DUANE MORRIS LLP  
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 776-7800  
Facsimile: (202) 776-7801

Dated: May 4, 2005